

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**JUL 10 2007**

Appl. No.: 10/692,142
Amdt. dated July 10, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 30, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 16-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected. Claims 4-15, 19 and 22-32 are objected to. Claims 1, 20 and claim 36 are independent claims. The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 6, 17, 18, 20, 23-25 and 27-35 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 4, 21, and 22 have been canceled. Claim 36 has been added. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of these amendments and the following remarks.

Objection of Claims

Claims 4-15, 22-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended these claims to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 20 and 21 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent no.: 6,178,243 to Pomerantz et al. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), the cited reference must contain every element of the claimed invention. Applicants have amended these claims such that the claims contain elements that are not described in Pomerantz.

Claims 3 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomerantz et al as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of the examiner taking official notice. The examiner takes official notice that the features of claims 16-18 are well known in the art of security systems. According to Chapter 7 of the MPEP, Applicants respectfully request the examiner to cite a specific example of such features.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the art of record (alone or in combination) teaches, discloses or even suggests the invention as recited in

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

713-772-1255

p.12

JUL 10 2007

Appl. No.: 10/692,142

Amdt. dated July 10, 2007

Reply to Office action of January 30, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 16-18, 20 and 21 stand rejected. Claims 4-15, 19 and 22-32 are objected to. Claims 1, 20 and claim 36 are independent claims. The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 6, 17, 18, 20, 23-25 and 27-35 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 4, 21, and 22 have been canceled. Claim 36 has been added. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of these amendments and the following remarks.

Objection of Claims

Claims 4-15, 22-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended these claims to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 20 and 21 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent no.: 6,178,243 to Pomerantz et al. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), the cited reference must contain every element of the claimed invention. Applicants have amended these claims such that the claims contain elements that are not described in Pomerantz.

Claims 3 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomerantz et al as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of the